

**ANTHONY
ASQUITH****Patent Attorney**

Anthony Asquith BSc
Registered Patent Agent
(Canada and USA)
Chartered Patent Attorney (UK)
European Patent Attorney

Office and
Postal Address:

Anthony Asquith & Co
#28 - 461 Columbia Street W
Waterloo, Ontario
Canada N2T 2P5

Telephone:

519 746 6732

Facsimile:

519 888 6093

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION


Please Note: If you are not the recipient named below, you are requested to treat this fax transmission as the confidential, private correspondence of the named recipient.

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION TO US PATENT OFFICE

Fax No: 703 872 9310

Certificate: I hereby certify that this paper is being fax-transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office today, 18 September 2003.

signed


Karen Owen=====
Attention of Examiner: HRUSKOCI, Peter A.

Art Unit: 1724

Phone: 305 3839
=====No of pages including this page: 2
=====

Serial No: 09/872,990

Our Ref: 437-01US


Applicant: WARD, Owen P. et al.
=====**REPLY TO OFFICE COMMUNICATION CONCERNING THIS
APPLICATION OR PROCEEDING**

This is in reply to the Office Communication dated 18 August 2003.

Please refer to the attached page titled REMARKS.

Please charge the fee for Submission of an Information Disclosure Statement, 37 CFR 1.17(p) in the amount of \$180., to our deposit account, number 01-2555.

Submitted by:


Anthony Asquith
Regn 32373
Agent for the ApplicantEnclo:
remarks (1 page)**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 22 2003

OFFICIAL

Pat.Apl.Nr 09/872,990

Docket 437-01US

REMARKS

responsive to Communication dated 18 August 2003

The Communication contends that the Reply filed 11 June 2003 was non-responsive, in that the Reply fails to respond to the rejections of claims 9 and 10.

Claim 9 was rejected on a the PTO's supposedly obvious combination of the reference Roslonski with the combination of Christy+Burnham+McMahon which was used to reject claim 1.

The Reply did address, in some detail, the allegations as to the obviousness of the Christy+Burnham+McMahon combination as applied to claim 1.

Claim 9 depends on claim 1. Given that the Christy+Burnham+McMahon combination as applied to claim 1 is not obvious, the Christy+Burnham+McMahon + Roslonski combination as applied to claim 9 cannot be obvious either.

The same point may be applied in respect of claim 10.

Submitted by:



Anthony Asquith
Regn 32373
Agent for the Applicant

Encls: (none)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 22 2003

OFFICIAL